



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,239	01/14/2002	Yuuichirou Ikeda	1046.1265	9427
21171	7590	10/19/2007	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			DANG, HUNG Q	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			2621	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/043,239	IKEDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hung Q. Dang	2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :03/05/2007, 12/16/2003, 12/26/2006, 01/30/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/25/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At pages 6-9, Applicant argues that Cohen does not disclose, "retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information." In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 8, lines 16-21, Cohen recites, "If the incoming record is deemed to be relevant in the light of the search parameters, then the database handling means calculates which records may be deleted and overwritten by the incoming record and replace the old record with the new record." In this segment, Cohen clearly discloses an obtaining information unit to receive the "incoming record". This received record is then overwritten on old record onto a "database", which corresponds to the "information retaining unit". As recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, between a new piece of data and an old piece of data, the old piece of data is the oldest piece of data. Having said that, when combining Cohen with Logan (or Marsh), who already discloses the character information, the Examiner replaces the word "record" disclosed in Cohen with "character information" in Logan (or Marsh) because one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the method of handling the "record" disclosed in Cohen can be applied to the handling of "character information" disclosed in Logan (or Marsh) to update old information with new information.

At pages 7 and 8, Applicant argues that Marsh teaches away from overwriting the oldest retained character information. In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. To one of ordinary skill in the art, updating information to get most up-to-date and most relevant information is necessary and compelling in information processing systems because, otherwise, the systems would fail to cope with continuously changing need and requirements expected by users.

For that reason, the claims are rejected as previously presented. See details below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US Patent 6,931,657) and Cohen et al. (US Patent 5,737,595).

Regarding claim 1, Marsh a reservation control apparatus, comprising: a search request unit requesting a program information retaining unit (column 6, lines 15-21) retaining program information containing a program broadcast date/time and a content information (column 4, lines 36-47), to search for the program information (column 5, lines 65-67; column 6, lines 1); a reservation request unit requesting a program reservation unit making a reservation of viewing or recoding the program, to reserve

Art Unit: 2621

viewing or recording the program (column 6, lines 8-14); an information obtaining unit obtaining character information related to the received program from contents of the received program while being received by a program receiving unit (column 5, lines 26-41; column 7, lines 40-61); an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit (column 5, lines 26-41; column 7, lines 40-61) wherein said search request unit makes said program information retaining unit search for the program information of the program related to the received program on the basis of character information at the time of receiving a predetermined notification according to an operation of a viewer in the character information retained by said information retaining unit (column 5, lines 64-67; column 6, lines 15-21), and said reservation request unit makes a request for reserving a receipt of the program or reserving a record of the program on the basis of the searched program information (column 6, lines 8-14).

However, Marsh does not disclose an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information.

Cohen et al. disclose an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information (column 8, lines 16-21).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the information retaining unit disclosed by Cohen et al.

into the reservation control unit disclosed by Marsh for an storage efficiency by deleting out-of-date data.

Regarding claim 2, Marsh also discloses said information obtaining unit includes a voice recognizing unit converting voices contained in the received program into text data and a text and data analyzing unit converting the text data into the character information and obtains the character information from the voices (column 7, lines 53-61).

Regarding claim 3, Marsh also discloses said information obtaining unit obtains the character information from a caption contained in the received program (column 7, lines 43-46).

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. (US Patent 6,751,401), Marsh (US Patent 6,931,657), and Cohen et al. (US Patent 5,737,595).

Regarding claim 1, Arai et al. disclose a reservation control apparatus, comprising: a search request unit (column 13, lines 60-62) requesting a program information retaining unit retaining program information containing a program broadcast

Art Unit: 2621

date/time and a content information, to search for the program information (column 13, lines 62-67; column 14, lines 1-2); a reservation request unit requesting a program reservation unit making a reservation of viewing or recoding the program, to reserve viewing or recording the program (column 14, lines 3-17); an information obtaining unit obtaining information related to the received program from contents of the received program while being received by a program receiving unit (column 13, lines 9-15, 52-59); an information retaining unit retaining the information obtained by said information obtaining unit (column 13, line 52 – column 14, line 2); wherein said search request unit makes said program information retaining unit search for the program information of the program related to the received program on the basis of character information at the time of receiving a predetermined notification according to an operation of a viewer in the character information retained by said information retaining unit (column 13, line 60 – column 14, line 2), and said reservation request unit makes a request for reserving a receipt of the program or reserving a record of the program on the basis of the searched program information (column 13, line 60 – column 14, line 18).

However, Arai et al. do not disclose the information to be character information and an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information

Marsh discloses the information to be character information (column 7, lines 53-61).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the character information disclosed by Marsh into the reservation control apparatus disclosed by Arai so that the program information can be derived from the closed caption and/or voice of the program. The incorporated feature would make the apparatus more robust and user-friendlier.

However, the proposed combination of Arai et al. and Marsh does not disclose the information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information.

Cohen et al. disclose an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information (column 8, lines 16-21).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the information retaining unit disclosed by Cohen et al. into the reservation control unit disclosed by Arai et al. and Marsh for an storage efficiency by deleting out-of-date data.

Regarding claim 2, Marsh also discloses said information obtaining unit includes a voice recognizing unit converting voices contained in the received program into text data and a text and data analyzing unit converting the text data into the character information and obtains the character information from the voices (column 7, lines 53-61).

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 3, Marsh also discloses said information obtaining unit obtains the character information from a caption contained in the received program (column 7, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 4, Arai et al. also disclose said information obtaining unit obtains the information in a data broadcast multiplexed with a program broadcast (column 2, lines 54-61).

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4 above.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 4 above.

Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan (US Pg-Pub 2002/0120925) and Cohen et al. (US Patent 5,737,595).

Regarding claim 1, Logan discloses a reservation control apparatus, comprising: a search request unit ([0092]) requesting a program information retaining unit retaining program information containing a program broadcast date/time and a content information ([0087]; [0091]; [0093]), to search for the program information ([0124]); a reservation request unit requesting a program reservation unit making a reservation of

Art Unit: 2621

viewing or recoding the program, to reserve viewing or recording the program (see [0262], [0271], [0275]); an information obtaining unit ([0074], [0076]) obtaining character information related to the received program from contents of the received program while being received by a program receiving unit ([0049], [0050], [0051], [0063], [0064]; [0150]); an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit ([0049], [0050], [0051], [0063], [0064]; [0150; [0151]]; wherein said search request unit makes said program information retaining unit search for the program information of the program related to the received program on the basis of character information at the time of receiving a predetermined notification according to an operation of a viewer in the character information retained by said information retaining unit ([0123], [0124]), and said reservation request unit makes a request for reserving a receipt of the program or reserving a record of the program on the basis of the searched program information (see [0262], [0271], [0275]).

However, Logan does not disclose an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information.

Cohen et al. disclose an information retaining unit retaining the character information obtained by said information obtaining unit in a way that is overwritten on the oldest retained character information (column 8, lines 16-21).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the information retaining unit disclosed by Cohen et al.

into the reservation control unit disclosed by Logan for an storage efficiency by deleting out-of-date data.

Regarding claim 2, Logan also discloses said information obtaining unit includes a voice recognizing unit converting voices contained in the received program into text data and a text and data analyzing unit converting the text data into the character information and obtains the character information from the voices ([0151]; [0152]; [0153]).

Regarding claim 3, Logan also discloses said information obtaining unit obtains the character information from a caption contained in the received program ([0151]; [0152]; [0153]).

Regarding claim 5, Logan also discloses said information obtaining unit accesses a scenario data retaining unit (see [0087], [0088], and [0124]) retaining scenario data of the program, and obtains information from the scenario data (see [0093]-[0097], [0124]).

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 5 above.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 5 above.

Claims 6-8, 14-16, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan (US Pg-Pub 2002/0120925) and Cohen et al. (US Patent 5,737,595) as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 17-19, 21 above, and further in view of Arai et al. (US Patent 6,751,401).

Regarding claim 6, see the teachings of Logan and Cohen et al. as discussed in claim 1 above. Further, Logan also discloses the program information including the scenario data being combined with the programming contents as transmitted to the users (see [0045]).

However, the proposed combination of Logan and Cohen et al. does not disclose the scenario data to be transmitted in multiplexing with the program broadcast.

Arai teaches the program information being multiplexed with program contents (see column 2, lines 56-57, lines 63-67).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the concept of multiplexing the program information with the program contents disclosed by Arai et al. into the concept of transmitting the program information as metadata, which contains the scenario data, in combination with the program contents disclosed by Logan to share common transmission medium or channel.

Regarding claim 7, Logan also discloses the scenario data contain an elapse time since a start of the program and character information describing the program contents at this elapse time (see [0093]-[0097]).

Regarding claim 8, Logan also discloses the scenario data contain an elapse time since the scenario data transmission data/time ([0090]) and character information describing the program contents at this elapse time ([0093]-[0097]).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2621

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Q. Dang whose telephone number is 571-270-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th:7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hung Dang
Patent Examiner



THAI Q. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600